APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/885,681	06/20/2001	Roger Kahn	4033/2A	6364

29858   7590   12/04/2003

BROWN, RAYSMAN, MILLSTEIN, FELDER & STEINER LLP
900 THIRD AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10022

EXAMINER
LU, KUEN S

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2177	

DATE MAILED: 12/04/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 June 2001</u>.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL.**   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) <u>1-25</u> is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) ℬ.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1.   The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

At Page 10, Examiner doesn't understand "published files 106" at line 11 and

"checking software 106" at line 10. It appears to be "published files 106" should

be "published files 116" and treated as "published files 116". Appropriate

correction is required.

Abstract

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the
disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2.   The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it exceeds 150 words. The

abstract also contains phrases which can be implied, such as "present invention" and

"are also disclosed". Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to
a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35
U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned
at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is
advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim
that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to
consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35
U.S.C. 103(a).

3.   Claims 1-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Bernado et al. (U.S. Patent 6,247,032) and further in view of Jammes et al. (U.S. Patent

6,484,149, hereafter "Jammes") and Copeland et al. (U.S. Patent 6,615,235, hereafter

"Copeland").

As per claims 1, 15 and 24, Bernardo teaches "a template engine for executing

templates to generate a content page" at col. 2, lines 56-62 by providing a tool for

facilitating the creation of Web pages with templates for predefined Web pages; and

"the template engine operative to generate a content page comprising content items

selectively retrieved from a data source and arranged on the content page as defined by

the template" at col. 6, lines 4-8 by comprising templates with database fields, forms,

views, texts and profiles.

Bernardo does not teach "each content item in the data source being associated

with time stamp information to indicate the last time the content item was modified", "a

dependency record for storing information regarding a relationship between content

items that comprise the content page and the content items stored in the data source";

or "dependency checking software for comparing information contained in the dependency record with time stamp information contained in the data source for each content item that comprises the content page, determining through the comparison those content pages that contain content items that have been modified in the data source, and instructing the template engine to re-generate a content page that contains modified content items".

However, Jammes teaches content item in the data source being associated with timestamp to indicate its last time of modification at col. 48, lines 58-65 by creatng a new record in the browse table to log the date and time of access and using software tool to create records in the browse table and product order table for establishing the relationship between content items and data fields in the database at col. 48, line 58 – col. 49, line 10.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Jammes' teaching into Bernardo's by enhancing Bernardo's Web page creating tool with functionality of recording timestamp when the content item was lastly modified such that the Web pages would contain timestamp for users to recognize its update history and Web pages would be much better fit for e-commerce application since all transactions are tracked by time.

The combined Bernardo-Jammes teaching does not teach "dependency checking software for comparing information contained in the dependency record with time stamp information contained in the data source for each content item that comprises the content page, determining through the comparison those content pages that contain

content items that have been modified in the data source, and instructing the template

engine to re-generate a content page that contains modified content items"

However, Copeland teaches "dependency checking software for comparing

information contained in the dependency record with time stamp information contained

in the data source for each content item that comprises the content page" by using a

database trigger to insert a record, comprising of data ID and timestamp columns, into

an invalidation table for indicating the time the cache data was updated by a source

other than JSP where Data ID can refer to whatever granularity is appropriate (col. 14,

lines 48-56), "determining through the comparison those content pages that contain

content items that have been modified in the data source" by using an invalidation

daemon to perform a cache invalidation algorithm by reading the record and comparing

the timestamp with the latest timestamp the doemon previously wokeup and processed

(col. 14, line 61 – col. 15, line 2) and "instructing the template engine to re-generate a

content page that contains modified content items" by notifying and invalidating the

fragment with respect to the Data ID (col. 15, lines 6-10), queueing fragment ID (col. 15,

lines 33-35), calling fragment cache to rerender the fragment, requesting JSP to obtain

raw or dynamic content from database and placing the content into frgament cache and

synchronizing the caches (col. 15, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

applicant's invention was made to combine Copeland-Jammes' teaching into Bernardo's

by using timestamp to validate Web page content itmes and refresh only the invalid

items because by doing so the routine of timely refresh all Web pages would be

eliminated, network performance would be improved and Web pages would be effectively and timely refreshed.

As per claim 2, Jammes further teaches "a plurality of dependency records are used to store the relationship between the content items that comprises the content page and the content items stored in the data source" at col. 48, line 58 – col. 49, line 10 by using browse and product order tables to associate content items in content page and the data fields in database.

As per claims 3 and 21, Bernardo teaches "the content page generated by the template engine comprises markup code" at col. 6, lines 10-13 by including HTML formatting components for Web page in the template.

As per claims 4 and 22, Bernardo teaches "the markup code is HTML" at col. 6, lines 10-13 by including HTML formatting components for Web page in the template.

As per claims 5 and 23, Copeland further teaches "the markup code is XML" at col. 21, lines 52-55 by applying XML markup language to the content page.

As per claims 6 and 16, Jammes further teaches "the dependency record contains parameters comprising name/value pairs of the information that are passed to the template engine to generate the content page" at col. 48, line 58 – col. 49, line 10 by using the combination of product order and browse tables to pass name/value pair and template_file to generate content page.

As per claims 7 and 17, Jammes further teaches "the dependency record comprises the address within the data source of the content items that comprise the content page"

at col. 48, line 58 – col. 49, line 10 by using the product order and browse tables to provide the data source information.

As per claims 8 and 18, Jammes further teaches "the dependency record comprises queries executed by the template engine to retrieve content items from the data source" at col. 52, lines 24-31 by using HTML engine to query and retrieve database records.

As per claims 9 and 19, Jammes further teaches "the dependency record comprises sub-template scripts used by the template engine to generate a content page" at col. 52, lines 24-31 by HTML engine to determine reference in the template file and further query the browse table for returning database record for the generation of content page.

As per claim 10, Jammes further teaches "the dependency record comprises the time the content page was generated" at col. 48, lines 47-57 by showing date and time in the product order table when the order was placed.

As per claim 11, Jammes further teaches "the dependency record comprises the date the content page was generated" at col. 48, lines 47-57 by showing date and time in the product order table when the order was placed.

As per claim 12, Jammes further teaches "content management software to manage content items and operative to issue instructions to the dependency checking software to regenerate a content page upon modification of a managed content item" at col. 45, lines 27-32 by Web server engine to invoke Web Page engine to open a template file for scanning and querying scripts to retrieve database information.

As per claim 13, Jammes further teaches "the content management software operative to issue instructions to the dependency checking software to re-generate a

content page upon modification of a template" at col. 45, lines 27-32 by Web server

engine to invoke Web Page engine to open a template file for scanning and querying

scripts to retrieve database information.

As per claim 14, Jammes further teaches "one or more dependency records to store

information regarding the relationship between a template and the content items that

comprise the content page" at col. 45, lines 27-32 by Web server engine to invoke Web

Page engine to open a template file for scanning and querying scripts to retrieve

database information.

As per claim 20, Jammes further teaches "publishing the content page generated by

the template engine to a disk" at Abstract, lines 3-5 by extracting Web page information

from database which implies the conent pages have been stored on the database.

4.   Claim 25 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Jammes et

al. (U.S. Patent 6,484,149) and further in view of Copeland et al. (U.S. Patent

6,615,235").

Jammes teaches storing one or more dependency records to capture a

relationship between content items that comprise the content page, the template

used to generate the content page, and the content items stored in the data

source" by using software tool to create and store records in the browse table

and product order table for establishing the relationship between content items

and data fields in the database at col. 48, line 58 – col. 49, line 10.

Jammes does not teach "comparing the data contained in the dependency

records with data contained in the data source to determine if the content page

is out of date" or "regenerating the content page where the comparison step determines that the content page contains modified content items".

However, Copeland teaches using timestamps to compare if a cache fragment is out of date by using an invalidation daemon to perform a cache invalidation algorithm by reading the record and comparing the timestamp with the latest timestamp the doemon previously wokeup and processed (col. 14, line 61 – col. 15, line 2) and "regenerating the content page where the comparison step determines that the content page contains modified" by notifying and invalidating the fragment with respect to the Data ID (col. 15, lines 6-10), queueing fragment ID (col. 15, lines 33-35), calling fragment cache to rerender the fragment, requesting JSP to obtain raw or dynamic content from database and placing the content into frgament cache and synchronizing the caches (col. 15, lines 60-67).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to combine Copeland's teaching into Jammes' by using reference table to record information on content page modification and regenerate only the modified pages because doing so would avoid the huge consumption of network and computer resources required to perform a routine to refresh all content pages.

Conclusions

The prior art made of record

A. U.S. Patent No.   6247032

B. U.S. Patent No.   6484149

C. U.S. Patent No.   6615235

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's

disclosure.

D. U.S. Patent No.   6457103

E. U.S. Patent No.   6216212

F. U.S. Patent No.   6557076

G. U.S. Patent No.   6584548

H. U.S. Patent No.   6360215

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Kuen S Lu whose telephone number is 703-305-4894.

The examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM to 5 PM, Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, John Breene can be reached on 703-305-9790. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

KL

Patent Examiner

December 1, 2003,   SRIRAMA CHANNAVAJJALA
                          PRIMARY EXAMINER